

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to paragraphs 6 and 39 in the specification, rejected claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Briffe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,057,786), and allowed claims 1-14, 22, and 23.

To begin, the Office Action contains numerous assertions concerning the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether those assertions are addressed specifically herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to them.

With respect to the objection to paragraphs 6 and 39 in the specification, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's identification of minor typographical errors, and Applicants have amended the specification to correct the noted errors. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the specification.

Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102(b) rejection of claims 15-21 because the Examiner has not shown that Briffe et al. discloses each and every element recited in those claims.

Claim 15 is directed to an airspace navigation system comprising a navigation data module to receive navigation data; a controller to detect a navigation event based on the navigation data; and a display to provide the navigation data in a horizontal mode and a vertical mode, in response to the navigation event.

The Examiner has not shown that Briffe et al. discloses at least an airspace navigation system including a display to provide the navigation data in a horizontal mode and a vertical mode, in response to the navigation event. In the statement

rejecting claim 15 based on the Briffe et al. reference, the Examiner asserts that “the claimed display is met by the primary flight display (No. 22) seen in Figure 5 that depicts both a horizontal mode and vertical mode in response to navigation data.” Office Action at 2-3. However, the Briffe et al. reference discloses that Figure 5 shows the speed, altitude, pitch and roll of the aircraft, and a horizontal mode with points showing the location of other aircraft. Examiner has not shown that Figure 5 in Briffe et al. discloses at least “a display to provide the navigation data in a horizontal mode and a vertical mode” as recited in claim 15. (emphasis added). Therefore, the Examiner has not shown that Briffe et al. teaches every element recited in Applicants’ independent claim 15, and the § 102(b) rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn.

Claims 16-21 depend from independent claim 15. Consequently, claims 16-21 should be allowed at least because the Examiner has not shown that Briffe et al. teaches every element recited in claim 15.


Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of this application, the withdrawal of the outstanding objections and claim rejections, and the allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation might advance prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to call Applicants’ representative at 571-203-2749.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 6-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 26, 2004

By: 
Lionel M. Lavenue
Reg. No. 46,859